



U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Office of Compliance and Enforcement
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20460

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 10
Office of Compliance and Enforcement
1200 Sixth Avenue, Suite 900
Seattle, WA 98101

**MUNICIPAL SEPARATE STORM
SEWER SYSTEM (MS4)
COMPLIANCE INSPECTION**

PIERCE COUNTY, WASHINGTON

**FINAL
INSPECTION REPORT**

Inspection Dates:

May 15–16, 2012

Report Date:

September 28, 2012

CONTENTS

	Page
SECTION 1.0 INTRODUCTION.....	1
SECTION 2.0 INFORMATION OBTAINED REGARDING COMPLIANCE WITH THE PERMIT.....	4
SECTION 2.1 CONTROLLING RUNOFF FROM NEW DEVELOPMENT, REDEVELOPMENT AND CONSTRUCTION SITES	7
SECTION 2.2 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE PROGRAM.....	10
SECTION 2.3 POST INSPECTION CORRESPONDENCE	15
 APPENDIX A: PHASE I MUNICIPAL STORMWATER PERMIT -NPDES AND STATE WASTE DISCHARGE GENERAL PERMIT FOR DISCHARGES FROM LARGE AND MEDIUM MUNICIPAL SEPARATE STORM SEWER SYSTEMS	
APPENDIX B: 2012 STORMWATER MANAGEMENT PROGRAM – MARCH 2012	
APPENDIX C: INSPECTION SCHEDULE	
APPENDIX D: EXHIBIT LOG	
APPENDIX E: PHOTOGRAPH LOG	

Section 1.0 Introduction

On May 15–16, 2012, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Region 10, and an EPA contractor, PG Environmental, LLC (hereinafter, collectively, the EPA Inspection Team) conducted an inspection of the Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) Program of Pierce County, Washington. Discharges from the Pierce County MS4 are regulated under the *Phase I Municipal Stormwater Permit – National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) and State Waste Discharge General Permit for Discharges from Large and Medium Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems* (hereinafter, the Permit; see [Appendix A](#)), issued by the State of Washington Department of Ecology (Ecology) and effective February 16, 2007. Pierce County (hereinafter, the County) maintains coverage under Permittee Coverage No. WAR04-4002. Permit modifications became effective on June 17, 2009 and September 1, 2010. The Permit expired on February 15, 2012, and on August 1, 2012 Ecology reissued the Permit, with limited changes, effective September 1, 2012 through July 31, 2013. Pierce County initially received coverage under NPDES municipal stormwater permits issued by Ecology in 1995.

The Permit authorizes Pierce County (the Permittee) to discharge stormwater and certain non-stormwater flows to surface waters and to groundwaters of the state from the MS4 owned or operated by Pierce County in the permitted area (defined as areas covered by the Phase I Municipal Stormwater Permit), under the Permit terms and conditions. Section S5.A of the Permit requires Pierce County to implement a Stormwater Management Program (SWMP). The Pierce County water quality manager confirmed that Pierce County is currently operating under the 2012 Stormwater Management Program, dated March 2012 (hereinafter, SWMP; see [Appendix B](#)).

With respect to the Permit, the Pierce County organization consists of four departments within the County; each has a significant role in implementing the stormwater program. These departments include the Public Works and Utilities Department, Facilities Management Department, Parks and Recreation Department, and Planning and Land Services Department. Although each of these organizational departments is assigned responsibilities associated with the SWMP, the Surface Water Management Division (SWM) in the Public Works and Utilities Department has overall responsibility for managing the stormwater program.

The EPA MS4 program compliance inspection evaluated facilities and projects in Pierce County. The inspection focused on three SWMP components described in Section S.5 of the Permit as follows:

- Controlling runoff from new development, redevelopment and construction sites.
- Illicit connections and illicit discharges detection and elimination (IC/IDDE).
- Operation and maintenance program.

The EPA Inspection Team did not observe deficiencies regarding Pierce County's IC/IDDE Program during the inspection; therefore, no further discussion of IC/IDDE is included in this report.

The purpose of the inspection was to obtain information that will assist EPA in assessing Pierce County's compliance with the requirements of the Permit and associated SWMP, as well as the implementation status of the current MS4 Program. The inspection schedule is presented as Appendix C.

The EPA Inspection Team obtained information through a series of interviews with representatives from Pierce County's Public Works and Utilities Department and various contractors, along with a series of site visits, record reviews, and field verification activities within Pierce County. The office session was held to obtain information regarding overall program management, program evaluation, and oversight. In addition, the EPA Inspection Team held a closing conference at Pierce County offices on May 16, 2012, with representatives from the respective organizational divisions attending.

The primary representatives involved in the inspection were the following:

Pierce County MS4 Program Compliance Inspection: May 15–16, 2012	
Pierce County SWM Representatives	Dan Wrye, Water Quality Manager John Collins, Water Quality Supervisor Renee Quenneville, Water Quality Specialist Rob Dudra, Water Quality Specialist Corrie Smith, Water Quality Specialist Justin Officer, NPDES Database Administrator Jim Gillette, Water Quality Specialist
Pierce County Road Operations Representatives	Bruce Wagner, Maintenance Manager Bryan Chappell, Engineering Technician Jeff Rudolph, Environmental Biologist
Pierce County Engineer's Office Representatives	Greg Hess, Engineering Resources Supervisor Ken Messinger, Project Inspector
Pierce County Development Engineering Representatives	Scott Murdock, Inspection Supervisor Larry Fremont, Project Inspector
Pierce County Facilities Management Representative	Eddie Parker, Maintenance and Operation Supervisor

Pierce County MS4 Program Compliance Inspection: May 15–16, 2012	
Washington State Department of Ecology Representatives	Lisa Cox, MS4 Permit Manager, Water Quality Vince McGowan, MS4 Permit Manager, Water Quality Carrie Graul, MS4 Permit Writer, Water Quality
EPA Representatives	Julie Congdon, EPA Region 10, MS4 Inspection and Enforcement Coordinator Sandra Brozusky, EPA Region 10, MS4 Inspector
EPA Contractors	Scott Coulson, PG Environmental, LLC Marleina Overton, PG Environmental, LLC

Section 2.0 Information Obtained Regarding Compliance with the Permit

Prior to the inspection, the EPA Inspection Team formally requested that Pierce County provide specific documentation for review by the team and have specific documentation available for review at the time of the inspection. The EPA Inspection Team provided Pierce County with a written list of requested records on April 3, 2012 (hereinafter, EPA Records Request; see [Appendix D, Exhibit 1](#)). In response, on May 4, 2012, Pierce County provided the EPA Inspection Team with an electronic spreadsheet containing Web site links to a file transfer protocol (FTP) site containing electronic copies of the documents requested. The spreadsheet and associated documents are hereinafter referred to as the Pierce County Response Inventory, and the complete spreadsheet is presented as [Appendix D, Exhibit 2](#). In addition, Pierce County made multiple documents available during the inspection. The EPA Records Request and Pierce County Response Inventory are referenced, as applicable, throughout this inspection report.

During the inspection, the EPA Inspection Team obtained documentation and other supporting evidence regarding compliance with the Permit and implementation of the Pierce County SWMP. The presentation of inspection observations in this report does not constitute a formal compliance determination or notice of violation; rather, it identifies potential Permit non-compliance and program deficiencies. Program deficiencies are areas of concern for successful program implementation. All referenced documentation used as supporting evidence is provided in [Appendix D](#), the Exhibit Log; photo documentation is provided in [Appendix E](#), the Photograph Log.

During the inspection, the EPA Inspection Team identified several elements of the Pierce County MS4 Program that were notable, including the following:

1. The County showed considerable effort in planning and preparing for the reissuance of the Phase I Municipal Stormwater Permit. For example, the County is using an asset management system to track the time and staff resources needed to complete required tasks. Additionally, the County had developed a report entitled, *Cost of Compliance Analysis Report for the Draft 2013-2017 NPDES Municipal Stormwater Permit*. The report was prepared as stage 1 of a two-stage program with stage 2 to be completed once Ecology issues a final permit. Included in Appendix A of the stage 1 report is a detailed spreadsheet that lists required activities and the associated permit reference for the activity, as well as the direct and indirect costs based on the level of effort expected to execute the activity (see [Appendix D, Exhibit 3](#)). The County had also conducted a staffing analysis to determine staff needs and workloads for the 2007-2012 period using a matrix that included permit functions, duties, and number of full-time employees needed to perform the required duties (see [Appendix D, Exhibit 4](#)).
2. The County had successfully integrated data from multiple database systems with its geographical information system (GIS), known as Countyview Pro GIS, that includes a comprehensive inventory of the MS4 owned and operated by the

- County. The GIS was used for several SWMP components, such as MS4 mapping and documentation and the operation and maintenance program. The GIS was easily shared among various county departments and the development and enhancement of the GIS was an ongoing activity.
3. MS4s nationwide are faced with the problem of homeowner's associations (HOAs) that are ill-equipped to conduct storm drain system maintenance. To address this issue, the County provides annual training workshops to HOAs for technical assistance on proper operation and maintenance of post-construction stormwater management best management practices (BMPs). The workshops are designed to connect HOAs with their designated Pierce County post-construction inspector, provide HOAs with copies of applicable engineered stormwater site plans, and encourage HOAs to provide the budget and resources necessary to conduct required maintenance. The workshops included presentations emphasizing the importance of maintaining stormwater systems and developing strategies for successful HOAs (see Appendix D, Exhibit 5).

Table 1 provides a summary of the EPA Inspection Team's overall inspection observations. Descriptions and details regarding the inspection observations, as well as supporting documentation, are provided in the applicable sections of this MS4 inspection report.

Table 1. Requirements of the Permit (WAR04-4002) and potential non-compliance/program deficiencies identified by the EPA Inspection Team

Program Elements and Permit Requirements	Potential Non-compliance/ Program Deficiency
<p>Controlling runoff from new development, redevelopment and construction sites</p> <p>Section S5.C.5.b.vi of the Permit requires the County's construction program to include a process of permits, plan review, inspections, and enforcement capability for both public and private projects using qualified personnel.</p> <p>See Section 2.1.1 of the inspection report for each program deficiency or item of potential non-compliance.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Pierce County needs to refine the construction inspection program to include improved oversight on County construction projects to ensure compliance with stormwater permits and the Site Development Manual (Section 2.1.1). <p>See the referenced section of the inspection report for further discussion of this issue.</p>
<p>Operation and maintenance program</p> <p>Section 13 of the Pierce County SWMP includes a brief overview of Pierce County's plans for complying with various components of Section S5.C.9 of the Permit.</p> <p>See Sections 2.2.1, 2.2.2, and 2.2.3 of the inspection report for the specific SWMP and Permit references for each program deficiency or item of potential non-compliance.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Concerns pertaining to improper pollution prevention practices and SWPPP implementation were noted during site visits at County facilities (Section 2.2.1). 2. SWPPPs for the County's Remann Hall and the Annex/Law Enforcement Services Administration (LESA)/911 Compound were deficient (Section 2.2.2). 3. Pierce County could improve its training program for employees who have operation and maintenance job functions (Section 2.2.3). <p>See the referenced sections of the inspection report for further discussion of these issues.</p>

Section 2.1 Controlling Runoff from New Development, Redevelopment and Construction Sites

Section 9 of the SWMP states that, as required under the Permit, “all County development projects must comply with the County’s Site Development Manual.” The Site Development Manual currently used by Pierce County and approved by Ecology is the *Pierce County 2008 Stormwater Management and Site Development Manual* (hereinafter, Site Development Manual) which was provided to the EPA Inspection Team in the Pierce County Response Inventory.

Volume I of the Site Development Manual states, “All new development and redevelopment shall comply with Construction Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) Elements #1 through #12 as detailed in Volume II, Section 2.2.3.” Volume II of the Site Development Manual includes twelve elements of construction stormwater pollution prevention that must be considered when developing a construction SWPPP and provides standards and specifications for BMPs to prevent or reduce the release of pollutants to waters of Washington. The following elements and BMPs from the Site Development Manual are relevant to the EPA Inspection Team’s findings described in Section 2.1.1 of this report:

- Element No. 12 states, “For construction sites that will disturb 1 acre or more and that discharge stormwater to surface waters of the state, a Certified Erosion and Sediment Control Lead (CESCL) shall be identified in the Construction SWPPP and shall be on site or on-call at all times.” Specific BMPs associated with the twelve elements have also been included in the Site Development Manual. BMP C160 outlines the purpose, conditions of use, and specifications for the CESCL (see Appendix D, Exhibit 6).
- Element No. 9 includes requirements for controlling pollutants on sites and BMP C153 outlines requirements for material storage and secondary containment to prevent, reduce, or eliminate the discharge of pollutants (see Appendix D, Exhibit 6).

2.1.1. Pierce County needs to refine the construction inspection program to include improved oversight on County construction projects to ensure compliance with stormwater permits and the Site Development Manual.

On May 15-16, 2012, the EPA Inspection Team conducted site visits at four construction sites to determine Pierce County’s responsibilities and oversight on construction sites. The purpose of the site visits was to document site conditions and observe Pierce County’s process for conducting site inspections and its capability to meet Permit standards. Summary observations regarding one of the sites are presented below due to their direct relevance to Pierce County’s obligations under its MS4 permit.

Wollochet Drive Northwest (County Road Project No. 5696) – Wollochet Drive Northwest from 40th Street Northwest to East Bay Drive Northwest, Pierce County, Washington

The Wollochet Drive Northwest construction project is a phased county road project. The active segment extended from approximately 40th Street Northwest to East Bay Drive Northwest.

The County maintained coverage (Permit No. WAR-012295) under the *Ecology NPDES and State Waste Discharge General Permit for Stormwater Discharges Associated with Construction Activity* (hereinafter, the Construction Stormwater General Permit), effective January 1, 2011. According to project overview documents provided by the County, the project consists of roadway widening; storm drain system improvements, additional turn lanes at intersections; and concrete curbs, gutters, sidewalks, and street lighting installation. Land disturbing activities began in July 2010 and the project was in its third year of construction. At the time of the inspection, active construction activities included the installation of retaining walls, roadway widening, and intersection improvements.

According to the project SWPPP dated April 22, 2010, the ultimate receiving water was Wollochet Bay. Wollochet Drive Northwest crosses Artondale Creek within the project area to the south of the Artondale Drive Northwest intersection. Wollochet Bay is located approximately 550 feet southeast of the Artondale Drive Northwest intersection.

The EPA Inspection Team observed the following with regard to erosion, sediment, and waste control at the construction site:

1. The County's contractor, Tucci and Sons, could not demonstrate during the site visit that a CESCL had been assigned to the project, or that CESCL inspection reports had been prepared. According to the County's project inspector, the contractor is required to provide a CESCL and conduct site inspections, and these stipulations are line items in the County's contract with Tucci and Sons.

The County's project inspector indicated that the County project manager and project inspector are the County construction representatives charged with administering enforcement of construction contract stipulations. The County's project inspector was aware that the County's contractor had not prepared the CESCL inspection reports as required in the County's contract with Tucci and Sons. The County's project inspector stated that he was also aware that this issue had been occurring for a length of time (approximately April 2011), and that he had discussed the issue with his supervisors at the County but had not been able to resolve the issue. The Construction Stormwater General Permit states that construction sites one acre or larger that discharge stormwater to surface waters of the state must have site inspections conducted by a CESCL.

2. Containers of pipe lubricant were stored outdoors without coverage or containment BMPs at the staging area located northeast of the Wollochet Drive Northwest and East Bay Drive Northwest intersection (see Appendix E, Photograph 1). The containers of pipe lubricant were stored adjacent to a drainage

- ditch which conveys flow under Wollochet Drive Northwest (see Appendix E, Photographs 2 through 4). According to the County's project inspector, a StormFilter® unit is planned for installation as part of the project. Although the StormFilter® unit will eventually serve the area draining the staging area, it was not yet installed.
3. Southwest of the staging area along Wollochet Drive Northwest, a portable toilet was not properly secured to prevent it from being knocked or blown over, and to prevent a subsequent chemical and sanitary waste spill from the toilet (see Appendix E, Photographs 5 and 6).

In summary, the County's contractor could not demonstrate during the site visit at the County-sponsored Wollochet Drive Northwest construction project that a CESCL had been assigned to the project, or that CESCL inspection reports had been prepared as required by the Construction Stormwater General Permit, the Pierce County SWMP, and the Site Development Manual.

Furthermore, Pierce County did not demonstrate adequate good housekeeping or pollution prevention BMPs at the Wollochet Drive Northwest construction project in accordance with the Site Development Manual.

Section S5.C.5.b.vi of the Permit requires the County's construction program to include a process of permits, plan review, inspections, and enforcement capability for both public and private projects using qualified personnel. To improve the overall program and ensure compliance with the Permit and Section 9 of the SWMP, the EPA Inspection Team recommends that Pierce County provide a process for the County and its contractors to maintain a CESCL on construction projects, conduct required inspections, and implement good housekeeping and pollution prevention BMPs on construction sites to prevent and control pollution of waters of the State of Washington.

Section 2.2 Operation and Maintenance Program

Section 13 of the SWMP includes an overview of Pierce County's plans for complying with the various components of Section S5.C. 9 of the Permit; however, the overview is brief and does not provide specific details for SWPPP development or implementation at County facilities, or ongoing training for employees of Pierce County.

On May 15-16, 2012, the EPA Inspection Team conducted site visits at four facilities owned and/or operated by Pierce County. The primary purpose of the visits was to observe Pierce County's process for developing and implementing SWPPPs at County facilities. Summary observations pertaining to three of the facilities are presented below due to their direct relevance to Pierce County's obligations under its MS4 permit.

2.2.1. Concerns pertaining to improper pollution prevention practices and SWPPP implementation were noted during site visits at County facilities.

Section S5.C.9.b.ix of the Permit requires the County to develop and implement a SWPPP for all heavy equipment maintenance or storage yards and material storage facilities owned or operated in the area subject to the MS4 Permit that are not required to have coverage under the *General NPDES Permit for Stormwater Discharges Associated with Industrial Activities* or another NPDES permit that covers stormwater discharges associated with the activity. In other words, SWPPP development and implementation is required for all heavy equipment maintenance or storage yards and material storage facilities that are covered under the MS4 Permit.

The EPA Inspection Team visited the Central Maintenance Facility and Remann Hall Juvenile Correction Facility, both of which are owned by Pierce County. Both facilities were also operated by Pierce County, with the exception of buildings associated with Progress House, a work release program that leases buildings at Remann Hall.

SWPPPs had been developed for these two facilities, and should therefore be fully implemented. Volume IV of the Site Development Manual was included as a component of the SWPPPs for these facilities. All referenced photographs are contained in Appendix E, Photograph Log.

Central Maintenance Facility – 4812 196th Street East, Spanaway, Washington

The Central Maintenance Facility is used by the County Road Operations Division and has various functions including the following: (1) vehicle and equipment maintenance and fueling; (2) vehicle and equipment storage; (3) vehicle and equipment washing; (4) road salt storage; (5) asphalt emulsion storage; and (6) other material storage (e.g., sand, rock, etc.). During the site visit, the EPA Inspection Team reviewed the SWPPP and made comparisons between the SWPPP requirements and site conditions.

The EPA Inspection Team observed the following with regard to pollution prevention and good housekeeping at the Central Maintenance Facility:

1. The concrete containment wall in the salt storage area had visible seepage under and through the wall (see Appendix E, Photograph 7). Temporary BMPs including sand bags and absorbent socks were observed around the containment wall in areas where the wall was compromised (i.e., cracked). In accordance with BMP A4.1 of the Site Development Manual, *Storage or Transfer (Outside) of Solid Raw Materials, Byproducts, or Finished Products*, impervious containment with berms, dikes, etc. and/or cover to prevent run-on and discharge of leachate pollutant(s) and total suspended solids should be provided for pollutant control. Furthermore, Section 4.2, Item No. 14 (*Maintenance*) in Vol. IV of the Site Development Manual states, “Promptly repair or replace all substantially cracked or otherwise damaged paved secondary containment, high-intensity parking, and any other drainage areas that are subjected to pollutant material leaks or spills.” The cracks in the containment wall should be repaired to prevent salt from potentially flowing to the adjacent rain garden south of the salt storage area.
2. Tracking from the vehicle wash area was observed on the concrete pavement outside the wash area door (see Appendix E, Photograph 8). The Equipment Services Division operates a wash area to steam clean construction equipment inside a fully enclosed covered building at the facility. Good housekeeping and pollution prevention measures should be implemented outside the wash area to prevent sediment and debris from coming off equipment and entering stormwater.
3. Sediment accumulation was observed in the secondary containment for asphalt emulsion (see Appendix E, Photograph 9). In accordance with the required BMPs listed in BMP A4.8 of the Site Development Manual, *Storage of Liquids in Permanent Aboveground Tanks*, the Permittee must sweep and clean the tank storage area regularly, if paved.
4. Containment valves at the containment areas for brine and asphalt emulsion did not have locking mechanisms to prevent unauthorized opening of the valves, potentially resulting in accidental discharges of pollutants from the containment areas (see Appendix E, Photographs 10 and 11). The EPA Inspection Team recommends that Pierce County install locks on the containment valves at the brine and asphalt emulsion secondary containment areas to regulate opening of the valves and prevent pollutants from entering the drainage system.

Remann Hall (Juvenile Correctional Housing/Holding Facility) – 1501 6th Avenue, Tacoma, Washington

The Remann Hall facility is used for various County Juvenile Court services and Facilities management activities including the following: (1) juvenile detention (i.e., secure residential) facilities; (2) vehicle and equipment maintenance and fueling; (3) pesticide and fertilizer storage; (4) other material storage (e.g., fill dirt, rock, topsoil, grass clippings, etc.); and (5) refuse storage. During the site visit, the EPA Inspection Team met with the maintenance and operations supervisor, reviewed the SWPPP, and made comparisons between the SWPPP requirements and site conditions.

The EPA Inspection Team observed the following with regard to pollution prevention and good housekeeping at Remann Hall:

1. Leachate from the trash compactor was observed on the asphalt pavement in a parking lot on the west side of the juvenile detention buildings (see Appendix E, Photograph 12). In accordance with BMP A4.4 of the Site Development Manual, *Storage of Solid Wastes and Food Wastes*, waste materials should be stored in suitable containers with leakproof lids and employees should be educated about the need to check for and replace leaking containers.
2. Soil stockpiled on the asphalt pavement was observed in the parking lot west of the Progress House (see Appendix E, Photograph 13). No BMPs were observed on or around the soil stockpile to prevent erosion or sediment transport. The maintenance and operation supervisor told the EPA Inspection Team that the soil was brought on site by the Progress House. In accordance with BMP A4.1 of the Site Development Manual, *Storage or Transfer (Outside) of Solid Raw Materials, Byproducts, or Finished Products*, impervious containment with berms, dikes, etc. and/or cover to prevent run-on and discharge of leachate pollutant(s) and total suspended solids should be provided for pollutant control. Furthermore, Section S.5 in Volume IV of the Site Development Manual states, "Some activities, such as stockpiling of raw materials, can be effectively covered with a sturdy tarpaulin or heavy plastic sheet made of impermeable material."
3. Oil residues were observed on the gravel in the vehicle and equipment maintenance and storage area (see Appendix E, Photographs 14 and 15). The maintenance and storage area was a three-sided covered building with a pervious ground surface and was located in the west portion of the site. Because of the overhead coverage, the gravel area would not be directly exposed to stormwater contact unless precipitation enters due to high winds. While BMP A4.9 of the Site Development Manual, *Parking and Storage for Vehicles and Equipment*, was included in the SWPPP, it lacked any specific requirements for implementing BMPs to address leaking vehicles and equipment, or spill response at maintenance and storage areas (see Appendix D, Exhibit 6).

2.2.2. SWPPPs for the County's Remann Hall and the Annex/Law Enforcement Services Administration (LESA)/911 Compound were deficient.

Section S5.C.9.b.ix of the Permit requires the development and implementation of SWPPPs for all heavy equipment maintenance or storage yards, and material storage facilities owned or operated by the Permittee in areas subject to the Permit, that are not required to have coverage under other NPDES permits. During site visits to Remann Hall and the Annex/Law Enforcement Services Administration (LESA)/911 Compound on May 15-16, 2012, inadequacies were found in the respective SWPPPs; therefore, specific observations for these facilities are discussed below.

Remann Hall (Juvenile Correctional Housing/Holding Facility) – 1501 6th Avenue, Tacoma, Washington

A description of the Remann Hall facility is included above in Section 2.2.1. The EPA Inspection Team reviewed the SWPPP during the site inspection and the following inadequacies were observed:

1. **The SWPPP did not include a description of the activities occurring at the facility.** The table of contents in the SWPPP listed “Facility Operations Description” as Section 1 (see Appendix D, Exhibit 7). The material inventory (page 25 of the SWPPP) and site maps included references to the aboveground storage tank, refuse storage, and bulk and construction materials storage area; however, a site-specific description of activities occurring at the facility should be included in the SWPPP, specifically the sources and activities that have the potential to contribute pollutants to stormwater.
2. **Updated site inspection records were not maintained in the SWPPP.** According to the SWPPP, SWM staff will perform site inspections in the wet season (October 1 to April 30) and in the dry season (May 1 to September 30). The site inspection log included in the SWPPP documented site inspections conducted on 6 October 2010, 20 April 2011, and 19 September 2011; however, according to the log a site inspection had not been performed in the most recent wet season. It should be noted that the most recent site inspection records were not included in the SWPPP on site, but a record of an inspection conducted by SWM staff on 13 January 2012 was provided to the EPA Inspection Team by the Water Quality Specialist, Corrie Smith, after the site inspection (see Appendix D, Exhibit 8). Pierce County should maintain current records of site inspections conducted at the facility in the SWPPP.
3. **A record of visual observations of discharges from the facility was not included in the SWPPP.** Section S5.C.9.b.ix of the Permit states, “The SWPPP shall include periodic visual observation of discharges from the facility to evaluate the effectiveness of BMPs.” The SWPPP provided to the EPA Inspection Team did not have records of periodic visual observations performed at the facility. In accordance with the Permit requirements, Pierce County must conduct visual observations of discharges from the facility and maintain records in the SWPPP.

Annex/Law Enforcement Services Administration (LESA)/911 Compound – 2401 S. 35th Street, Tacoma, Washington

The Annex/LESA/911 Compound includes an administrative building for the public to obtain permits, and also includes the 911 compound. The EPA Inspection Team reviewed the SWPPP during the site inspection and the following inadequacies were observed:

1. **The SWPPP did not include a description of the activities occurring at the facility.** The table of contents in the SWPPP listed “Facility Operations Description” as Section 1 (see Appendix D, Exhibit 9). At the beginning of the site visit the Pierce County representatives were not able to identify activities at the facility that warranted having a SWPPP. While Pierce County representatives located staff at the facility with knowledge of the operational activities occurring on site, the EPA Inspection Team began reviewing the SWPPP. The material inventory (page 28 of the SWPPP) and site maps included references to the aboveground storage tank and refuse storage; however, a site-specific description of activities occurring at the facility should be included in the SWPPP,

specifically the sources and activities that have the potential to contribute pollutants to stormwater.

2. **Updated site inspection records were not maintained in the SWPPP.** According to the SWPPP, SWM staff will perform site inspections in the wet season (October 1 to April 30) and in the dry season (May 1 to September 30). The site inspection log included in the SWPPP documented site inspections conducted on 4 October 2010, 20 April 2011, and 19 September 2011; however, according to the log a site inspection had not been performed in the most recent wet season. It should be noted that the most recent site inspection records were not included in the SWPPP on site, but a record of an inspection conducted by SWM staff on 10 February 2012 was provided to the EPA Inspection Team by the Water Quality Specialist, Corrie Smith, after the site inspection (see Appendix D, Exhibit 10). Pierce County should maintain current records of site inspections conducted at the facility in the SWPPP.
3. **A record of visual observations of discharges from the facility was not included in the SWPPP.** Section S5.C.9.b.ix of the Permit states, “The SWPPP shall include periodic visual observation of discharges from the facility to evaluate the effectiveness of BMPs.” The SWPPP provided to the EPA Inspection Team did not have records of periodic visual observations performed at the facility. In accordance with the Permit requirements, Pierce County must conduct visual observations of discharges from the facility and maintain records in the SWPPP.

2.2.3. Pierce County could improve its training program for employees who have operation or maintenance job functions.

Section S5.C.9.b.viii of the Permit requires the County to develop and implement an ongoing training program for employees who have primary construction, operations or maintenance job functions that could impact stormwater quality.

The County provided multiple examples of training materials and attendance rosters to the EPA Inspection Team, but did not maintain a comprehensive list of departments/divisions and employees that had received the various trainings. Pierce County SWM staff explained that it was the responsibility of each individual department to track attendance in the County’s current database system known as TRAIN. However, the EPA Inspection Team identified multiple departments, such as Solid Waste and Facilities Management, that did not maintain applicable attendance records in TRAIN (see Appendix D, Exhibit 11). Pierce County SWM staff further explained that the County plans to replace the TRAIN system with the new Pierce County Learning Management System (PCLMS), which will enable more consistent tracking of training activities.

Furthermore, the County also needs to ensure that appropriate training has been developed and implemented for facilities requiring SWPPPs. During site visits to Remann Hall and the Annex/LESA/911 Compound, the EPA Inspection Team reviewed

training records included in the SWPPPs. According to the records reviewed at the time of the site visits, the most recent employee training was conducted on April 22, 2011 (see Appendix D, Exhibit 12). This employee training session did not include training on the SWPPP, good housekeeping, or material management practices, and did not indicate who conducted the training or where the training was held.

In summary, Pierce County could improve its training by developing a more structured program for operations and maintenance training activities and associated tracking. Specifically, the program should include established schedules and frequencies for training activities, continued identification of staff or positions that require training, procedures for documenting and tracking training activities, and effectiveness measures for assessing the implementation of the training program.

Section 2.3 Post Inspection Correspondence

On June 21, 2012, Pierce County provided correspondence to the EPA Inspection Team entitled *Quick Start Program Enhancement Plan* (see Appendix D, Exhibit 13), that indicated that the Permittee had undertaken or scheduled a number of corrective actions to address several of the observations that were identified during the MS4 inspection. The EPA Inspection Team conducted a cursory review of the Quick Start Program Enhancement Plan and concluded that the plan indicates the County has completed or intends to initiate the following corrective actions:

1. Inspected Remann Hall on May 17, 2012 to address potential issues identified by the EPA Inspection Team and provided a copy of the Facilities Assessment report in Attachment 1 of the Quick Start Program Enhancement Plan.
2. Informed the contractor for the Wollochet Drive Northwest construction project of contract requirements and expectations related to erosion and sediment control measures and inspections required under their contract with the County. The County emphasized its ability to withhold payment to the contractor for not fully implementing on site documentation of the stormwater construction sites monitoring.
3. Established a centralized “NPDES stormwater permit training coordinator” in the Surface Water Management Division in June 2012 who is responsible for development, delivery, evaluation, and tracking and reporting all County NPDES stormwater Permit-related training for County staff, tenants of County facilities, and others.
4. Formalized as policy an alternative method for determining sites with a high risk potential for erosion and sedimentation.
5. Consulted with legal counsel regarding the process for updating the Site Development Manual.
6. Initiated Executive Order (EO) 2012-1 concerning stormwater management. According to Section II of the Quick Start Program Enhancement Plan, the EO established accountability for stormwater permit implementation, reaffirms the importance of oversight of County construction projects, and directs Surface

- Water Management to establish a formal centralized NPDES stormwater training coordinator.
7. Conducted site-specific SWPPP training on June 6, 2012 at Remann Hall. According to the records provided in the Quick Start Program Enhancement Plan over 20 staff attended the training sessions at Remann Hall.
 8. Plans to conduct site-specific SWPPP training for staff at all facilities with SWPPPs. The County provided a list of the priority facilities where site-specific SWPPP training will be implemented.
 9. Plans to review all existing SWPPPs for County facilities and site specific enhancements will be made to the SWPPPs to ensure site-specific maps/diagrams are included that locate activities/materials, needed maintenance, and source control actions.
 10. Plans to deploy a centralized staff training system on July 1, 2012 to keep records of all training events.